



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,685	04/10/2001	Srinivas Reddy	15114045720	2615

26059 7590 04/30/2003
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP/ 015114
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER	
CHANG, DANIEL D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2819
DATE MAILED: 04/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/832,685	REDDY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel D. Chang	2819	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 33-40 and 48-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 33-40 and 48-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Acknowledgement

Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed April 3, 2003.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 3, 2003 has been entered.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the connection between the output enable generation circuit and the first interconnect line (not shown in Fig. 5A) or the connection between the control input of the second tristate driver and the output enable generation circuit (not shown in Fig. 4) as claimed in claim 58 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 52 is objected to because of the following informalities: on lines 14-15, "the fourth input" lacks antecedent basis. On line 15, the word, "may" should be deleted in order to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Claim 60 is objected to because claim 60 is depended from the canceled claim 59. It appears that claim 60 should depend from claim 58. On line 2, the word, "may" should be deleted in order to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 33, 34, 37, and 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tavana et al. (US 5,682,107).

Regarding claims 33, 34, 37, and 38, Tavana et al. discloses, in figures 3A and 3B, a method of multiplexing (351) signals onto an interconnect line (Q0 or a line coupled to the input of the output buffer) comprising:

enabling a first tristate driver (a transistor coupled to the output of AND1) having an input coupled to a first logic element (J via VQ) and an output directly connected to the

interconnect line, such that a first signal (VQ) is driven from the first logic element onto the interconnect line using the first tristate driver;

dynamically tristating (by AND1) the first tristate driver; and

dynamically enabling a second tristate driver (a transistor coupled to the output of AND2) having an input coupled to a second logic element (H via ZQ) and an output directly connected to the interconnect line, such that a second signal (ZQ) is driven from the second logic element onto the interconnect line using the second tristate driver.

Tavana et al. does not disclose that the first or second tristate driver has a first and a second driver transistors.

However, it is well known in the art that a single transistor pass gate be replaced with two transistor (a combination of p-type and n-type) pass gate. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the multiplexer of Tavana with the two transistor (a combination of p-type and n-type) pass gate. It is an obvious matter of design choice and substitution of equivalence.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 2819

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 33-40 and 48-61 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-48 of U.S. Patent No. 6239613 (hereinafter, '613). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 33-40 and 48-61 of the instant application and claims 1-48 of '613 recite tristate control logic coupled to the plurality of tristate devices to dynamically enable and dynamically tristate the plurality of tristate devices. The difference between claims 33-40 and 48-61 of the present application and claims 1-48 of '613 is that claims of the present application is only broader.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 33-40 and 48-61 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel D. Chang whose telephone number is (703) 306-4549. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael J. Tokar can be reached on (703) 305-3493. The fax phone numbers for the

Application/Control Number: 09/832,685
Art Unit: 2819

Page 6

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Daniel D. Chang
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2819

DC
April 25, 2003

DANIEL CHANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER